

REMARKS

In this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 5, 19 and 21 have been amended. Claims 17, 18 and 20 have been cancelled. New claims 22-25 have been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Applicant advises that claims have issued in USP 7,137,747, which is a CIP of the present application.

In view of the indication of allowability of claims 20 and 21, claim 20 has been cancelled with the content of claim 20 now included in independent claim 19. New claim 22 includes the content of claim 21 and depends from claim 5. New claim 23 includes the content of claim 20 and depends from claim 1.

Amended claims 1 and 5 are supported in Figures 5 and 6 which show the back ends of the dampeners and the springs attached to the axle 56, but with their front ends attached at different locations on the isolator plate 102. Specifically, the front ends of the springs are attached further forward on the isolator plate 102 than the dampening elements. As a result, the forces exerted by the dampening elements and the springs are not aligned. New claim 24 is supported at 0031. New claim 25 is supported at 0035 and in Figures 5-9.

Turning to the prior art, as shown in Fig. 5 of Gottschalk et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,158,490, the spring 92 and the dampener 83 form the long sides of the parallelogram linkage. Hence, the forces exerted by the spring 92 and the dampener 83 act on parallel lines. In contrast, in amended claim 1, the spring and the dampener are not parallel and exert forces along non-parallel lines. Specifically, the spring is arranged at a small angle to the isolator plate, allowing for large amounts of pivoting movement with

very little deflection of the spring. The dampener in amended claim 1, on the other hand, is oriented at a different angle, where it can more actively provide dampening forces. Similarly, in amended claim 3, the orientations of the spring and dampening element are different, unlike in Gottschalk et al. where they are the same.

In amended claim 5, the front end of the dampener is attached to the arm at a location closer to the bar on the base, in comparison to the front end of the spring. In Gottschalk et al., on the other hand, as shown in Fig. 5, the spring and the dampener both act in the same parallel direction relative to the parallel links 56 and 57. No geometry changes are used to compensate for desired choices of dampening elements and springs.

In new claim 22, the spring and dampening elements are located within the envelope of the parallelogram, as shown in Figures 5-9, providing a compact design. In contrast, in Gottschalk et al., in Fig. 5, the spring extends outside of the parallelogram link 56.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is requested.

Dated: June 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No. 34055
Perkins Coie LLP
Patent - LA
P.O. Box 1208
Seattle, WA 98111-1208
Phone: (310) 788-3225
Fax: (206) 332-7198

PERKINS COIE LLP

By: Kenneth H. Ohriner
Kenneth H. Ohriner
Reg. No. 31,646